



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/691,534	10/24/2003	Volker Sauermann	07781.0112-00	6883

22852 7590 09/20/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
----------

CHUNG, DANIEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2677

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/691,534

Applicant(s)

SAUERMANN, VOLKER

Examiner

Daniel J. Chung

Art Unit

2677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,9,11-13,16,17,19-21,23,24,27-29 and 33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-5,8,9,11-13,16,17,19-21,23,24,27-29 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-24, 27-29, and 33 are presented for examination. Claims 3-4 have been cancelled by the amendment filed on 7-5-2005. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 7-5-2005. The objection to the drawing has been withdrawn because of amendment.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-24, 27-29, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoag (US 6,313,848) in view of Sommerer et al (US 2004/0100509)

Regarding claim 1, Hoag discloses that the claimed feature of a method for displaying data using a window having a width boundary comprising: determining that data [i.e. "tabular data"] for a list item cannot be displayed within the width boundary [i.e. "the width of workspace"; 340] [determining the dynamic height and width of the workspace available for the display of tabular data within window...] See Abstract line 6-8, col 2 line 25-29); creating a first window [i.e. "pane"; 511] and a second window [i.e.

“pane; 512] based on the determination that data for a list item cannot be displayed within the width boundary; splitting [by “dividing line”; 510] the data for the list item into a first portion [i.e. columns 1-6 in Fig 5] and a second portion [i.e. columns 7-12 in Fig 5], such that the first portion will fit into the first window [“the step of dividing workspace into panes...” See Abstract line 11-14, col 2 line 29-36); displaying the first portion [i.e. columns 1-6 in Fig 5] of the data for the list item in the first window [511]; and displaying the second portion [i.e. columns 7-12 in Fig 5] of the data for the list item wrapped into the second window [512] [“displaying within each pane...different columns are displayed in each pane....”] (See Abstract line 14-17, col 2 line 36-38, Fig 5-6)

Hoag does not specifically disclose that utilizing a first and second window to display the data, as recited in claim. However, such limitation is shown in the teaching of Sommerer et al. [i.e. ‘formatting the multi-window layout to show web page to fit within an display area’; “SmartView”] (See Fig 1, [5-6],[19],[23-26]) it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Sommerer et al into the teaching of Hoag, in order to render the display data optimally [i.e. improving user’s responsiveness to displayed data without requiring any specific user’s control], as such improvement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Hoag for providing user friendly image viewing with simple manner [i.e. less user’s operation].

Regarding claim 3, Hoag discloses that the data for a list item comes from more than one data source [i.e. columns 1-12]. (See Fig 5-6)

Regarding claim 4, Hoag discloses that displaying at least one column of data [i.e. "head column"; 522,523] from the first portion in the second window. (See Fig 5-6)

Regarding claim 5, Hoag discloses that displaying a color to comprehend whether a row of data in the second window corresponds to a row of data in the first window. (See Fig 5-6)

Regarding claim 8, Hoag discloses that handling an event associated with the window such that the event synchronously affects the second window. (See Fig 6)

Regarding claim 9, claim 9 is similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 9.

Regarding claim 11, claim 11 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 11.

Regarding claim 12, claim 12 is similar in scope to the claim 4, and thus the rejection to claim 4 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 12.

Regarding claim 13, claim 13 is similar in scope to the claim 5, and thus the rejection to claim 5 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 13.

Regarding claim 16, claim 16 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 16.

Regarding claim 17, claim 17 is similar in scope to the claim 1, and thus the rejection to claim 1 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, claim 19 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 19.

Regarding claim 20, claim 20 is similar in scope to the claim 4, and thus the rejection to claim 4 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 20.

Regarding claim 21, claim 21 is similar in scope to the claim 5, and thus the rejection to claim 5 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 21.

Regarding claim 23, claim 23 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 23.

Regarding claim 24, Hoag discloses that the claimed feature of a method for displaying data on a display screen comprising: creating a first window [i.e. "pane"; 511] and a second window [i.e. "pane; 512] if the data for a list item cannot be displayed within a width of a single window [i.e. "the width of workspace"; 340]; displaying a first portion [i.e. columns 1-6 in Fig 5] of the data [i.e. "tabular data"] for the list item on a line in the first window; and displaying a second portion [i.e. columns 7-12 in Fig 5] of the data for the list item wrapped onto a corresponding line in the second window. (See Abstract line 6-17, col 2 line 25-38, Fig 5-6)

Hoag does not specifically disclose that utilizing a first and second window to display the data, as recited in claim. However, such limitation is shown in the teaching of Sommerer et al. [i.e. 'formatting the multi-window layout to show web page to fit within an display area'; "SmartView"] (See Fig 1, [5-6],[19],[23-26]) it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teaching of Sommerer et al into the teaching of Hoag, in order to render the display data optimally [i.e. improving user's responsiveness to displayed data without requiring any specific user's control], as such improvement is also advantageously desirable in the teaching of Hoag for providing user friendly image viewing with simple manner [i.e. less user's operation].

Regarding claim 27, claim 27 is similar in scope to the claim 3, and thus the rejection to claim 3 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 27.

Regarding claim 28, Hoag discloses that displaying at least one datum [i.e. "head column"; 522,523] from the first portion on the corresponding line in the second display area. (See Fig 5-6)

Regarding claim 29, Hoag discloses that displaying an aid [i.e. "a number 1-10" shown in Fig 5-6] to comprehend that the line in the first display area wraps to the corresponding line in the second window. (See Fig 5-6)

Regarding claim 33, claim 33 is similar in scope to the claim 8, and thus the rejection to claim 8 hereinabove is also applicable to claim 33.

### ***Response to Arguments/Amendments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16-17, 19-21, 23-24, 27-29, and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel J. Chung whose telephone number is (571) 272-7657. He can normally be reached Monday-Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30am- 5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by



telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael, Razavi, can be reached at (571) 272-7664.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**571-273-8300 (Central fax)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

djc  
August 31, 2005



MICHAEL RAZAVI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600